

REMARKS

I. Summary of the Examiner's Action

A. Claim Rejections

As set forth on page 2 of the May 27 Office Action, claims 1 – 3, 6 – 7, 10 – 12 and 15 – 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,573,844 B1 to Venolia *et al.* (hereinafter “Venolia” or “the Venolia patent”) in view of United States Patent No. 5,963,671 to Comerford *et al.* (hereinafter “Comerford” or “the Comerford patent”), and further in view of United States Patent No. 7,136,047 to Shimada *et al.*, (hereinafter “Shimada” or “the Shimada patent”).

These rejections are respectfully disagreed with and traversed below.

II. Applicant's Response

A. Rejection of Claims 1 – 3, 6, 7 and 11 – 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant reproduces claim 1 here as a convenience to the Examiner (emphasis added):

1. A method comprising:
receiving a separate information unit entered with an input element of a
dynamic I/O arrangement belonging to a user interface of an
electronic device;
determining from the separate information unit whether input entry is in a
first mode or a second mode,

wherein when it is determined that the input entry is in a first mode, increasing in an equal amount size of members of a group of input elements; and
when it is determined that the input entry is in a second mode, determining based on probability which information units will likely be input next; and emphasizing by size the input elements corresponding to the information units likely to be entered next in the user interface of the electronic device, wherein the sizes of the emphasized input elements vary on a case-specific basis depending on respective probabilities of the information units associated with the input elements.

Applicant argues that the emphasized subject matter of claim 1 is neither described nor suggested by the art of record, whether taken singly or in combination.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness because the relied-upon combination does not teach every limitation of claim 1. In particular, claim 1 requires steps to be performed to determine which operating mode the device should implement depending on the identity of a separate information unit. The Examiner relies upon a portion of the Shimada patent that purportedly describes the selection of an operating mode by a user. The relevant subject matter of claim 1 is not directed to user selection of an operating mode. Rather, the device implementing the method of the invention determines from user input which information entry mode the device should implement from the identity of the separate information unit. It requires no deliberate selection of an operating mode by a user.

Further, the information entry modes in Applicant's invention use different means for emphasizing characters that are likely to be entered next. The respective references show no appreciation for the desirability of providing two different modes of emphasizing input elements. Applicant recognized that a one-size-fits-all approach does not address the different needs of a user when entering a telephone number in contrast to text. When entering a telephone number, it is helpful that the numbers be increased in size to set them apart from characters not used during telephone number entry. Since one number is as likely as another, it would be counterproductive to vary input element size. In contrast, when entering text, it is helpful to vary size since reliable statistics on what letters are likely to follow a particular letter or letter sequence are available.

None of the references relied upon by the Examiner show any appreciation for the desirability of being able to switch between such modes of operation. Neither do the references describe or teach the methods necessary to implement such a dual mode of operation.

As discussed in the preceding Amendment dated February 19, 2008, claims 1, 6 and 11 have been previously amended to recite subject matter directed to two input modes described in the specification. In a first input mode (for example, telephone number entry), the input elements corresponding to information units to be used to enter a telephone number are increased in size by an equal amount. In a second mode, the size of the input elements associated with information units likely to be selected next are

increased in size by an amount corresponding to their relative probability. In other embodiments of this aspect of the invention the size of input elements not corresponding to numbers may be decreased in size. In further embodiments of this aspect of the invention, the size of the portion of the user interface devoted to the numbers is increased in size, and the size of the remaining portion of the user interface is decreased in size. These further embodiments are now recited in the new dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully submits that the art of record neither describes nor suggests these combinations of features, whether taken singly or in combination.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 6 and 11 are allowable over the art of record. As a result, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1, 6 and 11 be withdrawn. Applicant also requests that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7, 10 and 12 be withdrawn as well since these claims depend from allowable base claims.

III. Conclusion

Applicant submits that in light of the foregoing amendments and remarks the application is now in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections be withdrawn and that the case be passed to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

August 27, 2008

Date

David M. O'Neill

David M. O'Neill (35,304)

Customer No.: 29683

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Telephone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: DOneill@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated.

8.27.2008

Date

Jessica Lee

Name of Person Making Deposit